



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,479	08/07/2003	Alejandro Wiechers	200207440-1	1075
22879	7590	08/13/2008		
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER MILIA, MARK R	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
08/13/2008	ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/635,479	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WIECHERS, ALEJANDRO
	<b>Examiner</b> Mark R. Milia	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-20 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/06/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 5/7/08 and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 1-4 and 10-20 are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/7/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that Roztocil (US 2001/0044868) does not disclose or suggest "a digital printer establishing a closed-loop communication link between the designer location and the print service location" and "creating a press ready file at the designer location using the current configuration information received from the digital printer via the closed-loop communication link". The examiner respectfully disagrees as Roztocil does disclose such features. Particularly, Roztocil states that a digital print shop contains computer workstations **114** and **116**, servers **118** and **120**, and output devices **122** connected via network **112**. Network **112** may include a plurality of networks types, such as wired, wireless, LAN, Ethernet, or WAN (Internet) (see paragraph 21). Print jobs are received and manipulated using computers **114** and **116** and as such makes up the designer location. Roztocil also states that computers **114** and **116** maybe

combined into one workstation (see paragraph 29 lines 11-14). Print server **120** and output devices **122** make up the print service provider location. Therefore, communication between the computers **114** and **116** and server **120** and output devices **122** is established based on the output device (printer) selected by the user. Roztocil further states that output device availability and capabilities provided to a user and are utilized in print job fulfillment (see paragraphs 32 lines 22-26 and 45). Roztocil also states that "print ready" files are created at the designer location (computers **114** and **116**) during job preparation which takes output device attributes into consideration (see paragraphs 25, 27-29). Thus, Roztocil discloses "a digital printer establishing a closed-loop communication link between the designer location and the print service location" and "creating a press ready file at the designer location using the current configuration information received from the digital printer via the closed-loop communication link".

Applicant also asserts that Kemp (US 2002/0078160) does not disclose or suggest packaging a printed output using an "automated packaging device". The examiner respectfully disagrees as Kemp does disclose such a feature. Particularly, Kemp states that service provider **2** may include equipment for various finishing processes, such as a specific type of binding (see paragraph 41) which is a type of packaging and it can be seen that the equipment of Kemp is meant to automatically finish (bind) the document. Kemp further states after printing and finishing is completed that a user can have the document(s) delivered or held for pick-up (see paragraph 64). Thus Kemp discloses packaging a printed output using an "automated packaging device".

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-4 and 10-20 set forth in the previous Office Action is maintained and repeated in this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 10-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roztocil in view of Kemp (US 2001/0078160).

Regarding claim 1, Roztocil discloses a method of managing workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said method comprising: a digital printer establishing a closed-loop communication link between the designer location and the print service provider location (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 22), the digital printer sending current configuration information stored within memory of the digital printer to the designer location via the closed-loop communication link (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52), creating a press ready file at the designer location using the current configuration information received from the digital printer via the closed-loop communication link (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 23, 25, and 27-28), submitting the press ready file from the designer location to the print service provider location via the closed-loop communication link (see paragraphs 22 lines 8-13, 25 lines 9-11, 29, and 32 lines 22-26) and receiving at the print service provider location a printed output of the press

ready file from the digital printer (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-4, 45-48, and 56).

Roztocil does not disclose expressly packaging the printed output at the print service provider location using an automated packaging device.

Kemp discloses packaging the printed output at the print service provider location using an automated packaging device (see Fig. 9 and paragraphs 41 and 64).

Regarding claim 10, Roztocil discloses a device for use with a design-to-press workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location, a print service provider location and a closed-loop communication link between them, said device comprising: a memory for storing current configuration information about the device (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52) and a communication module for connecting to the closed-loop communication link to communicate the current configuration information to the designer location and the print service provider location for consideration in design and preflight stages of the workflow (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 23, 25, 27-28, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52).

Roztocil does not disclose expressly an automated packaging device.

Kemp discloses packaging the printed output at the print service provider location using an automated packaging device (see Fig. 9 and paragraphs 41 and 64).

Regarding claim 11, Roztocil discloses a system for managing workflow in a commercial printing environment, said system comprising: a digital printer comprising memory that stores current configuration information about the digital printer and a

communications module that is used to communicate with other devices over a network (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52), wherein the digital printer is configured to: establish a closed-loop communication link with a designer location at which print jobs are created and with a print service provider location at which the print jobs are processed (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 22), send the current configuration information stored within digital printer memory to the designer location via the closed-loop communication link (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52), and generate printed outputs associated with the print jobs (see paragraphs 22 lines 8-13, 25 lines 9-11, 29, and 32 lines 22-26), and a device comprising memory that stores current configuration information about the device and a communications module that is used to communicate with other devices over a network (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52), wherein the digital printer is configured to: communicate over the closed-loop communication link with the designer location and with the print service provider location, send the current configuration information stored within the device memory to the designer location via the closed-loop communication link (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52).

Roztocil does not disclose expressly an automated packaging device to package the printed outputs generated by the digital printer according to the instructions associated with the print job.

Kemp discloses an automated packaging device to package the printed outputs generated by the digital printer according to the instructions associated with the print job (see paragraphs 40-41 and 64).

Roztocil & Kemp are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, printing based on printer capabilities.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the packaging device, as described by Kemp, with the system of Roztocil.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enable a user to receive his/her document(s) when, how, and where they desire to increase overall system efficiency and enhance user operability.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kemp with Roztocil to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 10, and 11.

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Kemp further discloses wherein the automated packaging device is a Design-to-Ship enabled packaging device that also forms part of the closed-loop communication link (see Fig. 9 and paragraphs 41 and 64).

Regarding claim 4, Roztocil further discloses verifying at the print service provider location that the press ready file will be produced at the print service provider location as instructed by information contained in the press ready file and, if not, correcting the press ready file to ensure production substantially as designed (see paragraphs 29-30, 45-48, and 56).

Regarding claim 14, Kemp further discloses wherein the digital printer sending current configuration information comprises the digital printer sending a table containing the current configuration information to the designer location (see paragraph 84).

Regarding claim 15, Roztocil further discloses wherein creating a press ready file at the designer location comprises adjusting at the designer location a print job to match capabilities of the digital printer relative to the current configuration information for the printing device (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-74, 45-48, and 56).

Regarding claim 16, Roztocil further discloses the designer location updating a job ticket associated with the print job (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-74, 45-48, and 56).

Regarding claim 17, Roztocil further discloses a preflight module of the print service provider location receiving the press ready file, reading the updated job ticket, requesting from the digital printer the current configuration information via the closed-loop communication link, and determining whether or not the digital printer is capable of properly processing the print job by comparing information contained in the updated job ticket and the current configuration information of the digital printer (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-74, 45-48, and 56).

Regarding claim 18, Roztocil further discloses the preflight module providing the print job and updated job ticket to the digital printer (see paragraphs 46-48).

Regarding claim 19, Roztocil further discloses the digital printer reading the updated job ticket and verifying that the digital printer can process the print job according to instructions contained in the updated job ticket (see paragraphs 46-48).

Regarding claim 20, Roztocil further discloses the digital printer providing updates as to printing status to the designer location and the print service provider location via the closed-loop communication link (see paragraph 45 lines 1-6).

5. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roztocil and Kemp.

Roztocil and Kemp do not disclose expressly wherein the automated packaging device is assigned a unique identifier.

However, it is well known in the art for printers, finishing/packaging devices to have unique identifiers, such as IP addresses, URLs, MAC addresses, etc. to allow the device to be identified and allow data to be easily transferred to and from the device.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign a unique identifier to the automated packaging device of Kemp because it would allow the device to be easily and accurately identified and also allow data to be easily and accurately transferred to the device.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571)272-7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached at (571) 272-7437. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark R. Milia

Examiner  
Art Unit 2625

/Mark R. Milia/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625  
/David K Moore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625